DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 244 932 SP 024 404

AUTHOR Pigge, Fred L.
TITLE Ancillary Findings of a Follow-Up Study.
PUB DATE 25 Apr 84
NOTE 41p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (68th, New Orleans, LA, April 23-27, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Grade Point Average; Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; *Job Performance; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Education Programs; *Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Bowling Green State University OH

ABSTRACT

A followup study of recent graduates from the undergraduate teacher education program at Bowling Green State University (Ohio) resulted in findings on their perceived needs, proficiencies, and what produced the indicated proficiencies. The subjects also evaluated their present attitudes toward teaching. In addition, the principal or department head of each graduate provided ratings of the graduate's on-the-job success. Analyses were made of 25 sets of scores or classifications derived from the approximately 400 practicing teachers and their principals who were initially involved in the study. Scores were related to teachers' academic ability, academic achievement, attitudes toward teaching, perceived needs, perceived proficiencies, evaluations of the various components of their teacher education programs, and the effectiveness or success of these teachers as rated by their superiors. Presented in this paper are findings resulting from analysis of the teachers' effectiveness ratings as provided by their principals, and analysis of the teachers' perceived proficiency scores and their attitudes toward teaching. Findings are presented in narrative and tabular format. A copy of the 7-page survey questionnaire, An Appraisal of My Preparation as a Teacher at Bowling Green State University, and a copy of the 3-page supervisor's questionnaire, An Appraisal of the Performance of a Teacher Prepared at Bowling Green State University, are appended. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED244932

ANCILLARY FINDINGS OF A FOLLOW-UP STUDY

Fred L. Pigge
College of Education
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Fred L. Pigge

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Paper Presented at the AERA Annual Convention
New Orleans, Louisiana
April 25, 1984
Session 27.37

SP 024 404

ANCILLARY FINDINGS OF A FOLLOW-UP STUDY

Introduction

It was not until the mid and late 1970's that widespread concerted efforts at determining, by teacher-education institutions, the on-the-job success of their graduates (and thus their programs) became a focus of inquiry. This focus was primarily caused by state, regional and national accreditation agencies placing more emphasis upon the connection between programs and products. More specifically, one of NCATE's 1979 standards recommends that institutions "evaluate the teachers it educates . . . after they enter the teaching profession."

This rather recent emphasis upon follow-up studies came at a time when there were in essence no models to follow and no published criteria for judging current institutional practices and exhibits in this area.

The personnel and recent practices of the R & D Center for Teacher Education at The University of Texas at Austin have exerted a strong positive leadership in the area of follow-up studies. Between 1979 and 1982, this agency contributed three publications, each primarily a collection of papers written by noted authorities dealing with some phase or element of follow-up studies (Hord and Adams, 1981; Hord and Hall, 1979; Hord, Savage, and Bethel, 1982).

The R & D Center was also instrumental in the preparation and distribution of Borich's 1979 paper entitled "Three Models for Conducting Follow-up Studies of Teacher Education and Training." Borich distinguished between the Needs Assessment, Relative Gain, and Process-Product models. The major instrument and procedures of the present study are more closely associated with Borich's needs assessment model than with the other two.

In this regard, the primary objective of the instrumentation involved in the present study was to provide evaluative follow-up data on and from recent graduates of the 41 undergraduate teacher-education programs at Bowling Green State University. The graduates completed an instrument which provided data on their perceived needs and proficiencies and what, in their judgment, produced the indicated proficiencies. Other sections of the instrument permitted the graduates to evaluate various aspects of their teacher-education programs and to indicate their present attitude toward teaching (see Appendix 1). In addition, the principal or department head of each graduate provided ratings of the graduate's on-the-job success (Appendix 2). The expectations of this objective were realized with the distribution of booklets of findings to faculty in each program area during the 1982-83 academic year.

The purpose of the present paper is to present ancillary findings to the follow-up study. More specifically, this paper presents the findings of subsequent analyses of 29 sets of scores or classifications derived from approximately 400 practicing teachers and their principals

who were initially involved in the larger follow-up study. The scores were related to the teachers' academic ability, academic achievement, attitudes toward teaching, perceived needs, perceived proficiencies, evaluations of various components of their teacher-education programs, and the effectiveness or success of these teachers as rated by their principals or department heads.

The Data and Methodology

The primary data for this study were gathered during the spring of 1981 from approximately 400 BGSU-prepared teachers (and their principals or department heads) who were in their first through fifth year of teaching in the State of Ohio. Secondary sources of data were teachers' high-school and college ability, college course history, and achievement data which were stored on various university computer tapes.

These sources of data permitted the collection (and later analyses) of 25 sets of scores or classifications related to each teacher. Two of these classification variables were years of experience and area of teaching (elementary, secondary, specialized, and special). The other 23 variables were grouped into these four broader classifications:

1. Teachers' ability, as evidenced by their high school rank and five ACT scores (in subsequent tables of findings, these variables are denoted as: H.S. decile, ACT English, ACT Mathematics, ACT Social Science, ACT Natural Science, and ACT composite).

2. Teachers' academic achievement at the university level, as denoted by overall 4-year grade point averages, and grade point averages just for (1) education courses/experiences, (2) communication courses, and (3) psychological foundation courses (denoted later as overall GPA, education GPA, comm GPA and psy GPA).

3. Teachers' evaluations of their teacher-education programs, their perceived needs and proficiencies in 19 competency areas, and their attitudes toward teaching. These eight self-reported measurements were derived from a seven page follow-up instrument entitled An Appraisal of My Preparation as a Teacher at Bowling Green State University (see Appendix 1). This instrument, in various forms, has been used four times during the last dozen years. Each succeeding form was a revision or updating of an earlier edition. The use of an earlier edition was widely acknowledged as evidenced by publications (Pigge, 1978; Gargiulo and Pigge, July 1979; Gargiulo and Pigge, Winter, 1979; TEPFU, 1983, p. 3) and subsequent requests for copies of the instrument. A description of the eight scores (and their codes which are used in subsequent tables of findings) are:

1. Teach 1, Need. These scores indicated teachers' overall or cumulative felt need for 19 competencies (Need Column, Section B, Appendix 1). The lowest possible Need "score" was 19x1 or 19, highest possible "score" was 19x5 or 95.

2. Teach 2, Proficiency. These scores indicated the teachers' cumulative perceived classroom proficiencies in the same 19 competency areas. (Proficiency Column, Section B, Appendix 1). Likewise, a teacher's proficiency "score" could range from a low of 19 to a high of 95.

3. Teach 3, Major, Minor, Group. These ratings came from the first 8 questions in Section D of the follow-up instrument. These questions or items primarily pertained to the teachers' evaluations of the number and content of courses in their majors, minors, and general university group requirements. A "3" was always coded for the best item response; for 5 of the 8 items a "1" was coded for the worse and "2" for the middle response (items 2, 4, 6, 7, and 8). For items 1, 3, and 5, any response other than "3" was coded "1.5." Thus, a teacher's maximum "score" for this section was 24, the minimum was 9.5.

4. Teach 4, Education Courses. These scores were computed from the seven items presented at the end of Section D of the follow-up instrument. In brief, the teacher could give a specific education course or experience a score of "5" to a score of "1" for its contribution in her/his teacher-education program. A teacher's maximum score this section was 35 points.

5. Teach 5, Off-Campus Field Experiences. The five items providing the "scores" for this variable were in Section E of the instrument. The teachers were asked to give quality ratings to the supervision received by them within various off-campus courses and experiences. They also were asked to denote a value rating for these experiences. A teacher's highest possible "score" was 25.

6. Teach 6, Advising. These six items (Section F) permitted the teachers to rate the quality of academic and career advising they received as students. The maximum score was 30, the minimum was 6.

7. Teach 7, Attitude. These five items (Section HA) provided an Attitude Toward Teaching score for

each respondent. The maximum score was 25, the minimum was 5.

8. Summary Evaluation (HB1). The last item on the instrument (Section H, Item B1) asked the teachers to respond, within a strongly agree (5) to a strongly disagree (1) format, to the following statement: I was adequately prepared by BGSU as an entry level teacher.

4. Teachers' on-the-job success or effectiveness ratings, as evidenced from a rating form completed on each teacher by his/her principal or department head. This form produced five scores for each teacher: Prin 1, cumulative score for the Instructional items; Prin 2, items related to Human Relations and Attitudes Toward Teaching; Prin 3, Management/Discipline, Prin 4, Evaluation/Self Appraisal; and Prin Total, the composite score. The 42 competency or proficiency items comprising this instrument were based upon the results of previous studies at BGSU and upon the findings of state-wide surveys done in Georgia (Ellet, 1980) and Ohio (1980). Various test-retest total instrument reliability coefficients have ranged from the mid .80's to low .90's.

In brief, during 1981 BGSU provided the Ohio State Department of Education a listing of the social security numbers of all its 1976-80 education graduates. The State Department, by matching these social security numbers with principals' fall reports of their teachers, provided multiple sets of address labels of our Ohio teachers and their principals. Sampling was done with highly productive program areas, such as elementary and special education. For less productive programs, the entire BGSU sub-population of Ohio teaching graduates was contacted during the spring of 1981. Six-hundred ninety-four completed teacher instruments were returned (out of 1386); 903 (65%) principal instruments were received. The present findings are based upon all possible matches (410) of data from a teacher and his/her principal or department head. For some analyses, such as multivariate analysis of variance, the total N was reduced to approximately 300. These analyses included only those persons who had complete data sets, i.e., with none of the 25 sets of scores or classifications missing.

The Findings

The findings are presented in two sections. The first section presents an analysis of the teachers' effectiveness ratings as provided by their principals. The second section is devoted to an analysis of the teachers' perceived proficiency scores and their attitudes toward teaching.

Teachers' Effectiveness Ratings

The principals provided five sets of scores, namely Prin 1, 2, 3, 4, and total. The means for these variables, broken down by teachers' years of experience and teaching area, are presented in Table 1. (Table 1 also presents the means for other selected variables.)

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 1 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The principal means indicate that without exception the fifth-year teachers were rated higher, for each part of the instrument, than were the teachers with fewer years of experience. The data in Table 1 also reveals, overall, that the elementary and special education teachers received higher effectiveness scores than did the specialized (art, music, HPE, industrial education, etc.) and secondary teachers.

Table 2 presents two sets of multivariate analysis of variance F's which indicate the effects of the various listed variables on or between combinations of the Prin 1 through Prin 4 scores. The first column of Hotelling F's were influenced by the classification or categorical variables of teachers' years of experience, subject area in which they were teaching, and a summary 5-category evaluation of how well they thought they were prepared by BGSU as entry level teachers. The second column of F's were not influenced by these variables.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 2 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The first column of F's indicate that the Prin 1 through Prin 4 scores (or perhaps some combination of these scores) were significantly related to the teachers' years of experience, their subject or teaching area, their overall college grade point averages, and their evaluations of the career and advising functions which they experienced at BGSU.

The second column of F's were not influenced by the three aforementioned categorical variables. These F's reveal that the Prin 1 through Prin 4 scores were significantly related to or influenced by the teachers' overall GPA, perceived proficiency within 19 competency areas, and their evaluations of the college career and advising functions.

In brief the data presented in Table 2 indicated that the following variables were somehow related to how the principals rated the effectiveness of the teachers: the teachers' years of experience,

subject or teaching area, overall college grade point averages, self-perceived proficiency, and evaluations of the colleges' career and advising systems.

Table 3 presents a summary of the results of five univariate analysis of variance computations. These analyses attempted to ferret out what might have produced the significant multivariate F's presented in Table 2.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 3 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The top section of Table 3 shows that the F for total principal scores was 1.98 which was significant at alpha level .003. The multiple R computed from this analysis was .41; R^2 was 16%. In other words, the 20 contributing variables (years of experience through Teach 7 in Table 3) determined or were associated with 16% of the variance of the principals' total ratings. Similar interpretations may be made for the Prin 1 through Prin 4 scores.

The bottom part of Table 3 presents data which reveal the variables that significantly contributed to the overall F's presented at the top of the table. Teachers' overall GPA was the only variable that was significantly related to each of the five tests, i.e., Prin 1 through Prin 4 and Prin Total.

For Prin 1, those scores related to the principals' ratings of teachers via the items classified as "instruction," the variables Teach 2 (self-perceived proficiency levels) and Teach 7 (Attitude Toward Teaching) were, in addition to GPA, influential contributors to the sums of squares which resulted in the significant overall F of 1.94.

For the Human Relations/Attitude items (Prin 2), the overall GPA was the only significant contributing factor.

For Prin 3 (teachers' management and discipline functions), years of experience and overall GPA were both significant factors.

For Prin 4 scores (teachers' self-appraisal/self-evaluation), the only significant factor was overall GPA.

For interpretation purposes, the zero-order correlation coefficients presented below show a low but positive relationship between each criterion (Prin 1 through Prin Total) and the significant factors from Table 3.

Zero-Order Correlation Coefficients

	Prin 1	Prin 2	Prin 3	Prin 4	Prin Total
Overall GPA	.18	.18	.19	.18	.19
Teach 2	.28	.20	.18	.28	.25
Teach 7	.14	.12	.10	.13	.13

In addition, the Prin 3 means presented in Table 1 indicate a positive relationship between years of experience and principal ratings of teachers' ability or effectiveness in the area of classroom management and control. These data along with findings from Table 3 indicate that higher principal ratings were associated with teachers': higher overall GPA's, higher self-perceived proficiency ratings, higher attitude toward teaching scores, and more years of teaching experience.

A step-wise multiple regression analysis was completed for each component of the principals' ratings. These analyses had a two-fold purpose: (1) possibly to verify significant factors earlier discussed, and (2) to discern other possibly significant contributing factors of the teachers' effectiveness ratings.

Table 4 presents the significant factors from the step-wise regression analyses. It should be mentioned that the categorical variables of years of experience and area of teaching were omitted from these analyses. The teachers' summary evaluations of how well they thought they were prepared as entry level teachers (Item HB1) were treated as interval scores in these step-wise analyses. (Earlier, these evaluations were treated as categorical data.)

- - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 4 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - -

For Prin Total, the data presented in Table 4 reveal that five significant predictor variables were selected ($\alpha < .15$). Four of these variables were positively related to the Prin Total scores; the ACT Social Science scores were slightly negatively related. The statistical procedure selected the ACT score not because of its individual predictive ability of the criterion but for its low relationship to the other predictor variables. The same reasoning may be applied to the selection of the other ACT tests for predicting the Prin 1 through Prin 4 ratings.

It is noteworthy that three of the significant predicting or controlling variables listed in Table 4 were also regularly selected by the earlier alternate statistical procedures (see Tables 2 and 3). These common variables were: overall GPA, Teach 2 (self-perceived proficiency scores), and Teach 7 (Attitude Toward Teaching scores). An additional variable which was consistently selected for each of the Principal scores was the teachers' summary evaluation of how well they thought they were prepared for their initial year of teaching.

In summary, the various analyses have indicated that the principals' ratings of the success or effectiveness of the teachers were related to the following variables:

1. Teachers' years of experience. The one set of principal scores (ratings) that seemed most influenced by this variable was those related to the classroom management/discipline functions of the teachers (Table 3, Prin 3). The teachers with more years of experience were generally associated with higher principal ratings in the area of classroom management and discipline.

2. Subject or teaching areas of the teachers (Tables 1 and 2). The elementary and special education teachers were given higher ratings on each part of the principals' instrument than were the specialized and secondary teachers.

3. Teachers' overall college grade-point averages (Tables 2, 3, and 4). Teachers with higher grade-point averages were, on the whole and for each section of the principal's instrument, associated with somewhat higher principal ratings than were teachers with lower grade-point averages.

4. Teachers' self-perceived proficiency ratings for 19 competency areas (Tables 2, 3, 4, Teach 2). A positive zero-order correlation was found between these scores and each principal rating. The two areas, however, that seemed to be most related to these Teach 2 scores were Prin 1 (teachers' instructional effectiveness) and Prin 4 (teachers' self-appraisal/evaluation).

5. To a smaller extent ($.15 > p > .09$) than the preceding four variables, the teachers' attitudes toward teaching (Teach 7) appeared to be associated with principal ratings assigned especially in the area of instruction (Tables 3 and 4) but also in Prin Total, Prin 2, and Prin 3 (Table 4).

Another variable, the "scores" assigned by the teachers to the colleges' academic and career advising functions (Teach 6), was noted in the MANOVA as having an influential effect on or between combinations of the Prin 1 through Prin 4 scores. However, the data analysis whose summary was presented in Table 3 revealed that Teach 6 scores were not significantly related to any individual subtest of the Prin scores. Table 4 reveals that these scores were selected (though barely at $\alpha = .146$) as a predictor of principals' ratings in the area

of classroom management/discipline. The happenstance that this variable was selected by the statistical procedures cannot meaningfully be interpreted. Regardless, the contributing influence of this variable in explaining the principals' ratings is so small that for all practical purposes it may be omitted from any subsequent discussion.

Teachers' Responses to the Follow-Up Questionnaire

A set of statistical analyses was completed to address the question, "Were there any discernable factors which influenced the way in which the teachers responded to the follow-up instrument?"

Table 5 presents two sets of multivariate F's that were derived in attempting to determine effects of the various variables on or between combinations of Teach 1 through Teach 7 scores.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 5 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Data presented in Table 5 reveal that the following variables were related to how the teachers responded to one or more sections or combinations of sections of the instrument:

1. Their years of experience
2. Their teaching or subject areas
3. How well they thought they were prepared as entry level teachers (Item HB1)
4. How the principals perceived their teaching effectiveness (Prin 1, 2, and 3).

In regard to the above and in attempting to explain why years of experience was significant, the teachers' mean responses to Teach 1 through Teach 7 were examined and the following selected descriptions are offered:

1. For Teach 1 and Teach 2, the need and proficiency sections, no clear consistent sequential experience effects were shown. First-year teachers showed the greatest need and fifth-year teachers the second greatest need (Teach 1, Table 1). The first and fifth year teacher also indicated the greatest proficiency in the selected competency areas (Teach 2, Table 1).
2. For Teach 3 through Teach 7, the first year teachers had the highest means and in general the teachers with increasingly more years of experience had lower means (Table 1).

For teaching or subject areas, data in Table 1 reveal that the elementary and special education teachers reported greater need, greater proficiency, more positive evaluations to off-campus work, and a more positive attitude toward teaching than did the specialized and secondary teachers.

The correlation coefficients between Item HB1 scores and Teach 1 through Teach 7 scores, respectively, were +.09, +.26, +.43, +.31, +.30 and +.37. These values indicate that teachers who thought they were well prepared as entry level teachers tended to give somewhat more positive responses to the various sections of the follow-up instrument than did teachers who thought themselves less-well prepared.

Positive principal evaluations, if valid, should merely be a manifestation of better prepared and more effective teachers. It seems a reasonable assumption that these teachers would denote more positive ratings on the follow-up survey than would teachers who were perceived to be less effective.

Two areas of specific interest were the teachers' composite self-evaluations of their proficiency in 19 competency areas (Teach 2 scores) and their attitudes toward teaching (Teach 7 scores). Table 6 presents an analysis of variance of the Teach 2 scores.

- - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 6 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - -

Data presented near the top of Table 6 reveal that the multiple correlation coefficient between the Teach 2 scores and the 17 other variables (presented in the lower part of the table) was .50; R^2 was 25%. Thus, 25% of the variance in the Teach 2 scores was controlled or associated with these 17 variables. However, the significant individual determiners of the Teach 2 variance were: (1) teachers' subject or teaching area, (2) how well they thought they were prepared for their entry level teaching positions, (3) scores on various ACT tests and (4) how well they were perceived to be performing in the classroom.

The zero-order correlations between the Teach 2 scores and the variables listed above were low and positive (+.28 and below) with the exception of the ACT scores. These latter correlations were low but negative, as shown below:

	ACT Eng	Math	Soc Sci	Nat Sci	Comp
Teach 2	-.09	-.05	-.08	-.14	-.10

In summary, the data revealed (1) that elementary and special education teachers perceived themselves to be more proficient than specialized and secondary teachers, (2) those who rated their teacher education programs higher in effectiveness tended to more highly

evaluate their proficiency in selected competency areas, (3) those who scored higher on the ACT tests had a slight tendency to rate themselves lower on the proficiency items, and (4) that there was a relationship between principal ratings and teachers' perceived effectiveness scores.

Data in Table 7 reveal that 16% of the variance in the teachers' Attitude Toward Teaching scores were accounted for by the variables listed in the lower part of the table.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 7 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Two variables which have consistently been significant determiners of other criterion scores also exhibited their influence on the teachers' attitude scores. The two variables were the subject or teaching areas of the teachers and how well they thought they were prepared as entry level teachers. Two additional variables were somewhat influential in helping to explain the variance in the attitude scores; these were high school deciles and the grade-point averages in college psychology courses.

With further inspection, the elementary and special education teachers possessed higher attitudes toward teaching, on the average, than did specialized and secondary teachers. There was also a positive relationship between how well the teachers believed they were prepared as entry level teachers and their attitudes toward teaching. A rather weak but positive relationship ($r = +.06$) was found between psychology grade point averages and attitudes toward teaching. A weak but negative relationship ($r = -.10$)* was found between high school deciles and teachers' attitudes toward teaching, i.e., there was a very slight tendency for those who ranked higher in their high school class to possess somewhat of a less positive attitude toward teaching. These four variables, the first two to a greater extent than the latter two, were the primary determiners of the controlled variance (16%) of the attitude scores.

A Frame of Reference

Studies and discussion on the use of rating forms, other possible correlates of teaching success, and attitudes of first-year teachers are reviewed in this section.

Rating Forms

The teacher effectiveness or success scores in the present analyses were derived from rating forms that were completed by principals or department heads. With limited budgets and the necessity to provide licensing and accrediting agencies with continual

*After correcting for coding highest decile "1" and the lowest "10".

evidence that their graduates are satisfactory on-the-job performers, very few teacher education institutions nor for that matter school systems can afford, nor have the expertise, to conduct teaching effectiveness product studies, i.e., determining the success of their graduates in promoting pupil growth.

An excellent overview of the problems and progress in measuring teacher performance and determining teacher effectiveness is presented in a book by Borich (1977). In relation to teacher effectiveness, Medley and Mitzel (1959), Morrison and McIntyre (1969), Rosenshine (1971), Soar (1973), McNeil and Popham (1973), Schofield and Start (1979-80), Soar, Medley, and Coker (1983), and other researchers have shown there is little or no relationship between teachers' ratings and pupil growth or have professionally criticized the use of rating scales in determining the performance of teachers. Prevalent among these criticisms are the subjectivity of the raters, the high inference nature of the instruments, teachers' halo effects, and the general observational errors of central tendency and/or leniency.

Medley (1973, p. 42) provided a very succinct summary of the relationships between the use of rating forms and findings of research regarding pupil growth when he concluded: "The evidence that pupils learn just as much from teachers rated ineffective by experts as they do from teachers rated effective by the same experts is impressive, and has been verified again and again."

However and regardless of the research findings regarding supervisor ratings of teachers and the teachers' performance in relation to pupil growth, in the vast majority of school systems across the nation the present practices of teacher evaluation are radically no different than the past. Today's teachers are primarily and in a real pragmatic sense successful or unsuccessful on the basis of the perceptions of others, most notably their principals who gather firsthand data and supplementary data from pupils, peer teachers, and parents.

For instance, the principals and/or the department heads of entry-level teachers in most states, just after approximately six months into the teachers' first school year, must decide whether to cause the issuance or non-issuance of a contract for the following year.

Even if significant pupil growth were a criterion for a teacher's second-year contract, the fulfillment of that criterion would by necessity need to be inferred from the results of selected and probably short and limited units of instruction. The administrator will likely make his/her decision on the basis of perceptions, professional judgement, and feelings of "ownership" than on the basis of statistical data.

The teachers' ratings in the present study are variable but cumulatively are high, probably due to errors of leniency. It is also assumed that these ratings are influenced by the teachers' halo effects and the fact that many if not most of the administrators were

indirectly rating themselves as judges or selectors and guiders, shapers, and leaders of professional talent.

Due to the prevalence of such actions in the real world for judging teacher success, the use of rating forms gain validity and essentiality in the conduction of follow-up studies. Institutions' questionnaire follow-up studies or findings should of course be validated periodically with in-depth on-site follow-up interviews and observations.

A statement by Vance and Schlechty (1982, p. 25) aptly captures the essence of the difference between the theoretical (what we should do based on research) and practical real-world realities (what is actually done):

> Although some educational theoreticians and researchers may regard the link between measured academic ability, technical and instructional competence, and effective teaching as tenuous, politicians and policy makers have demonstrated their strong belief in the existence of such a relationship.

They went on to explain that policy makers in most states have and are now requiring standardized tests for entry into and/or exit from teacher-preparatory programs without evidence that such scores are related to the ability of teachers to cause pupils to grow.

GPA and Academic Ability

James and Dumas (1976) concluded from their study that GPA gave some prediction of success or failure in teaching, regardless of the type of criterion used for success. They did, however, explain for their sample that a grade point requirement exceeding 2.40 or 2.50 would probably serve no useful purpose in improving product quality. In other words, beyond a certain minimal level of demonstrated academic competence, such as a grade point average of 2.50, GPA predicted little if anything about a student's potential as a teacher.

Quirk et al. (1973) reviewed many studies that dealt with GPA and principal ratings or other measures of success. Quirk reported that Shea in a 1955 study found a correlation of +.50 between teaching success as measured by the M-Blank at the end of first year of teaching and GPA for 110 teachers. Quirk also indicated that Thacker in 1964 reported, from a study of 155 first-year teachers in North Carolina, correlations of +.08 between GPA and principals' ratings and +.05 between principals' ratings and education GPA's.

Approximately 40 years ago, Lins (1946) reported a correlation of +.31 between teacher ratings and four-year GPA's. Between teacher ratings and major subject GPA's it was .23, and with education courses GPA it was .29.

Vittetoe (1977) reported that the range of GPA's for 100 graduates from his institution who later failed as teachers (on basis of principal ratings) was from 2.16 to 3.85.

Brophy's data (1982) suggested that effective teachers tended to be drawn disproportionately from among the more academically able of those who teach.

Teaching Areas

Durflinger in 1948 concluded that the trait patterns making for success in high-school teaching is different from that making for successful elementary-school teaching. Thirty-two years later, Schofield and Start (1979-80, p. 132) stated ". . . there is a growing conviction, though based as yet on meager research evidence, that different subject areas and grade levels may call for different qualities, understandings, and attitudes in teachers."

Attitudes

Queen and Gretes (1982) reported follow-up results from 2361 first-year teachers in North Carolina. Among the many findings, those that are more closely related to the present study are: (1) the majority of these teachers (60%) felt that the college programs had prepared them well for their first-year of teaching, (2) a majority reported that college supervisors and cooperating teachers played effective roles in their preparation--as critics and role models, (3) approximately 60% claimed that methods courses and knowledge they had gained in other college courses had been helpful during their first year of teaching, and (4) in relation to attitudes toward teaching, approximately 80% said they were satisfied with their positions, 52% said they planned to make teaching a permanent career, and 63% claimed they would advise others to pursue teaching careers.

Conclusions

All the findings or concluding statements that are presented in this section have one thing in common; the influence of the variables related to the specific findings were of sufficient strength to be picked up as statistically significant at the previously noted alpha levels within one or more of the described analyses.

In this regard, however, it should be cautiously noted that the various predictor or controlling variables accounted for rather small proportions (.15 to .25) of the total variance in the three dependent variables. The three dependent variables were: (1) the various principal ratings of teachers' on-the-job effectiveness, (2) teachers' self-perceived proficiency ratings, and (3) teachers' attitudes toward teaching.

Selected subparts of the principals' ratings of teachers (instructional, human relations, classroom management, and self-appraisal) were positively related to teachers' (1) years of experience (most obvious finding was that the more experienced teachers were given higher ratings for classroom management/discipline), (2) overall college GPA's (this factor was related to each of the four principals' ratings), (3) self-perceived proficiency ratings (most obvious connection was with the ratings for

the instructional items), and (4) attitudes toward teaching (again most obvious connection was with the instructional items). The teachers' subject or teaching areas were also related to the principals' ratings. It was found that elementary and special education teachers were rated higher in effectiveness by their principals than were the specialized and secondary teachers.

In regard to the other two dependent variables the elementary and special education teachers perceived themselves as more proficient in several competency areas and also professed more positive attitudes toward teaching than did the specialized and secondary teachers. Thus, teaching area was a significant factor in the explanation of all three sets of dependent scores, i.e., principal ratings, teachers' self-perceived proficiency levels, and teachers' attitudes toward teaching.

Teachers' self-perceived proficiency levels and attitudes toward teaching were both positively related to the evaluations of how well the teachers thought the teacher-education programs had prepared them as entry-level teachers.

Teachers' self-perceived proficiency scores were positively related to the principals' ratings of their classroom effectiveness. Whether the former and its manifestations were influencing the latter, or vice-versa, or both, would be an interesting topic for further investigation.

Teachers' self-perceived proficiency ratings were slightly negatively related to their ACT scores. The teachers' attitudes toward teaching scores were found to be negatively related to their high school deciles; in other words, there was a tendency for the more academically qualified teachers, as judged by their high school ranks, to have somewhat less positive attitudes toward teaching.

Table 1

Selected Means Categorized By Years of Experience and Teaching Area

		Selected Variables																
Years Teaching Exp	N	Overall GPA	ACT Comp	Educ GPA	H.S. Decile*	Prin 1 Inst	Prin 2 H.R.	Prin 3 Mgmt	Prin 4 Eval	Prin Total	T_1 Need	T_2 Prof	T_3 Major	T_4 Educ Courses	T_5 Off-Campus	T_6 Advising	T_7 Attitude	Summary Eval (Item HB1)
5	81	3.14	22.01	3.39	2.83	74.88	58.77	31.35	39.23	204.23	75.03	69.89	18.40	23.22	18.85	19.56	21.03	3.78
4	112	3.18	22.40	3.42	2.51	72.37	57.49	30.57	38.03	198.46	74.97	67.80	18.55	23.70	19.27	20.34	20.96	3.88
3	90	3.14	21.51	3.43	2.45	71.53	56.64	29.80	37.27	195.24	73.07	65.84	18.52	23.54	19.57	21.68	21.07	3.87
2	53	3.11	21.06	3.39	2.73	70.59	56.85	29.17	36.93	193.54	73.20	66.28	18.30	24.46	19.04	21.32	20.80	3.59
1	54	3.22	21.37	3.41	2.52	72.76	58.54	30.20	37.57	199.07	78.09	68.85	19.56	24.87	20.19	22.35	22.09	4.24
Teaching Area																		
Elem	79	3.19	21.37	3.38	2.56	74.33	58.94	31.00	39.19	203.44	76.53	69.82	19.09	25.04	20.96	21.11	22.00	4.05
Special Ed.	103	3.20	20.96	3.45	2.69	75.22	58.58	30.74	39.85	204.39	79.86	71.69	18.71	23.76	20.05	20.32	21.44	3.91
Specialized	157	3.12	21.50	3.35	2.77	71.05	57.15	30.21	36.88	195.29	71.74	65.36	18.52	23.06	18.32	21.11	20.53	3.85
Secondary	68	3.15	24.14	3.50	2.20	70.26	56.09	29.48	36.19	192.01	72.10	65.51	18.07	24.04	18.59	20.65	21.04	3.59

*Decile 1 is highest (P_{90} and above)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

MANOVAS'

THE EFFECTS OF VARIOUS VARIABLES ON, BETWEEN, AND AMONG COMBINATIONS OF PRIN 1 THROUGH PRIN 4 RATINGS

Variable	Including Categorical Variables		Excluding Categorical Variables	
	Hotelling Trace F	p	Hotelling Trace F	p
Years Experience	1.82	.02**	-	-
Subject Area	2.22	.01**	-	-
Summary Eval (Item HB1)	1.90	.11	-	-
Overall GPA	2.28	.06**	2.85	.02**
H.S. Decile	.30	.88	.19	.94
ACT English	.44	.78	.53	.71
ACT Math	1.08	.37	1.12	.35
ACT Soc Sci	.72	.58	.93	.45
ACT Nat Sci	1.01	.40	1.07	.37
ACT Comp	.98	.42	1.13	.34
Educ GPA	.97	.42	.81	.52
Comm GPA	1.39	.24	1.20	.31
Psy GPA	.33	.86	.33	.86
Teach 1, Need	.73	.57	.81	.52
Teach 2, Prof	1.86	.12	2.68	.03**
Teach 3, Maj, Min, Req	.57	.69	.78	.54
Teach 4, Educ Courses	.91	.46	.54	.71
Teach 5, Off-Campus	.85	.49	.90	.47
Teach 6, Advising	2.52	.04**	5.10	.001*
Teach 7, Attitude	.84	.50	.83	.51

** Significant ($p \leq .06$) influence

Table 3

Univariate ANOVAS' of the Principals' Ratings of Teachers

For Each of 5 Analyses Source	df	Test	F	p	R	R^2
Model	28	Prin Total	1.98	.003	.41	.16
Error	282	P-1 Inst	1.94	.004	.40	.16
Total	310	P-2 HR	1.81	.009	.39	.15
		P-3 Management	1.85	.007	.39	.16
		P-4 Eval	2.24	.001	.43	.18

Variable Contributing to Model SS[a]	df	Prin Total		Prin 1		Prin 2		Prin 3		Prin 4	
		F	p	F	p	F	p	F	p	F	p
Years Experience	4	1.40	.23	1.15	.33	1.16	.33	2.25	.06**	1.41	.23
Subject Area	3	.24	.87	.29	.84	.01	.99	.27	.85	1.69	.17
Summary Eval (HB1)	4	1.64	.16	1.28	.28	1.66	.16	1.79	.13	1.71	.15
Overall GPA	1	6.86	.01**	4.75	.03**	7.51	.01**	7.80	.01**	6.14	.01**
H.S. Decile	1	1.07	.30	.97	.32	.88	.35	1.07	.30	1.06	.30
ACT English	1	1.19	.28	.78	.38	1.59	.21	1.14	.29	.98	.32
ACT Math	1	.93	.34	.23	.63	1.90	.17	1.16	.28	.82	.37
ACT Soc Sci	1	.45	.50	.08	.78	1.03	.31	.51	.48	.48	.49
ACT Nat Sci	1	1.90	.17	.97	.32	2.70	.10	1.85	.17	1.94	.17
ACT Comp	1	1.53	.22	.66	.42	2.42	.12	1.67	.20	1.41	.24
Educ GPA	1	1.23	.27	.45	.50	2.05	.15	1.36	.24	1.21	.27
Comm GPA	1	.43	.51	.06	.81	.65	.42	.27	.60	1.26	.26
Psy GPA	1	.21	.65	.15	.69	.09	.76	.14	.70	.56	.46
Teach 1, Need	1	.10	.76	.39	.53	.03	.86	.05	.82	.00	.98
Teach 2, Prof	1	1.46	.22	2.86	.09*	.24	.62	.38	.54	2.56	.11
Teach 3, Maj, Min, Req	1	.05	.82	.00	.97	.37	.54	.18	.67	.04	.84
Teach 4, Educ Courses	1	.32	.57	.52	.47	.50	.48	.12	.73	.03	.87
Teach 5, Off-Campus	1	1.59	.21	2.07	.15	1.30	.25	1.53	.22	.76	.38
Teach 6, Advising	1	.00	.99	.01	.93	.41	.52	.26	.61	.15	.70
Teach 7, Attitude	1	2.40	.12	2.85	.09*	1.72	.18	2.30	.13	1.66	.20
	28										

[a]Type III SS, SAS Package

**Significant ($p<.05$) determiners of principal ratings.

* Less significant ($.10 > p > .05$)

Table 4

STEPWISE REGRESSION FOR THE PRINCIPAL RATINGS
(Entry into model was set at alpha .15 or less)

Prin Total			Prin 1 Instruction			Prin 2 Human Relations			Prin 3 Management			Prin 4 Evaluation		
Predictor Variable	F	p	Predictor Variable	F	p	Predictor Variable	F	p	Predictor Variable	F	p	Predictor Variable	F	p
Overall GPA	14.53	.001	Overall GPA	14.18	.001	Overall GPA	13.80	.001	Overall GPA	15.21	.001	Overall GPA	12.25	.001
ACT Soc Sci	6.97	.009	ACT Soc Sci	5.60	.019	ACT Soc Sci	7.37	.007	ACT Soc Sci	7.76	.006	ACT Comp	5.75	.017
Teach 2, Prof	2.89	.09	Teach 2, Prof	6.01	.015	Educ GPA	2.87	.091	Educ GPA	2.23	.136	Teach 2	6.86	.009
Teach 7, Att	2.19	.14	Teach 7, Att	2.44	.119	Teach 7	2.25	.135	Teach 6	2.13	.146	Summary Eval (Item HBI)	4.67	.032
Summary Eval (Item HBI)	5.26	.02	Summary Eval (Item HBI)	2.50	.115	Summary Eval (Item HBI)	11.16	.001	Teach 7	2.25	.135			
									Summary Eval (Item HBI)	7.66	.006			
R = .34 R^2 = .11			R = .34 R^2 = .11			R = .34 R^2 = .11			R = .32 R^2 = .10			R = .33 R^2 = .11		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 5

MANOVAS'

THE EFFECTS OF VARIOUS VARIABLES ON, BETWEEN,
AND AMONG COMBINATIONS OF TEACH 1 THROUGH TEACH 7 SCORES

Variable	Including Categorical Variables		Excluding Categorical Variables	
	Hotelling Trace F	p	Hotelling Trace F	p
Years Experience	1.44	.06*	-	-
Subject Area	4.80	.0001**	-	-
Summary Eval (1tem HBI)	4.65	.0001**	-	-
Overall GPA	.89	.52	1.67	.11
H.S. Decile	1.08	.38	1.31	.24
ACT English	.90	.50	.81	.58
ACT Math	.66	.70	.72	.66
ACT Soc Sci	.46	.86	.40	.90
ACT Nat Sci	1.06	.39	1.09	.37
ACT Comp	.70	.67	.66	.71
Educ GPA	.31	.95	.16	.99
Comm GPA	.87	.53	1.17	.32
Psy GPA	.82	.57	1.18	.32
Prin 1, Inst	1.79	.09*	1.64	.12
Prin 2, Human R	2.10	.04**	3.91	.001**
Prin 3, Management	1.06	.39	2.14	.04**
Prin 4, Eval	1.22	.29	1.25	.28

** Significant at p<.05

* Significant between p's of .05 and .10

Table 6

Univariate ANOVA of Teachers' Self-Evaluations of Their Teaching Proficiency (Teach 2)

Source	df	SS	ms	F	p	R	R^2
Model	25	6011	240	3.75	<.001	.50	.25
Error	283	18129	64				
Total	308	24140					

Variable Contribution to Model SS[a]	df	F	p
Years Experience	4	.57	.68
Subject Area	3	5.53	.001**
Summary Eval (Item HB1)	4	6.48	.0001**
Overall GPA	1	1.95	.16
H.S. Decile	1	1.78	.18
ACT English	1	3.13	.08*
ACT Math	1	1.92	.17
ACT Soc Sci	1	2.65	.10*
ACT Nat Sci	1	4.97	.03**
ACT Comp	1	3.24	.07*
Educ GPA	1	.01	.93
Comm GPA	1	1.15	.29
Psy GPA	1	.06	.80
Prin 1, Inst	1	4.36	.04**
Prin 2, Human R	1	2.93	.09*
Prin 3, Management	1	.14	.70
Prin 4, Eval	1	.19	.67
	25		

[a]Type III SS (SAS Package)

** Significant (at $p<.05$) determiners of accounted variance in teachers' self-evaluations (R^2).

* Less significant ($.10 \geq p > .05$) contributors.

Table 7
Univariate ANOVA of Teachers' Attitudes
Toward Teaching (Teach 7)

Source	df	SS	MS	F	p	R	R^2
Model	25	476	19.04	2.12	.002	.40	.16
Error	283	2547	9.00				
Total	308	3023					

Variable Contribution to Model SS[a]	df	F	p
Years Experience	4	.82	.52
Subject Area	3	2.92	.03**
Summary Eval (Item HB1)	4	3.79	.01**
Overall GPA	1	.14	.71
H.S. Decile	1	3.41	.07*
ACT English	1	.25	.61
ACT Math	1	.01	.92
ACT Soc Sci	1	.00	1.00
ACT Nat Sci	1	.31	.58
ACT Comp	1	.07	.79
Educ GPA	1	.70	.40
Comm GPA	1	.09	.76
Psy GPA	1	3.06	.08*
Prin 1, Inst	1	2.48	.12
Prin 2, Human R	1	.11	.74
Prin 3, Management	1	.00	.96
Prin 4, Eval	1	.54	.46
	25		

[a]Type III SS, SAS Package

** Significant determiners ($p < .05$) of attitudes toward teaching

* Less significant ($.10 > p > .05$)

References

Borich, Gary D. The Appraisal of Teaching, Concepts and Process. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1977.

Borich, Gary D. Three Models for Conducting Follow-up Studies of Teacher Education and Training. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1979.

Brophy, Jere. "Successful Teaching Strategies for the Inner-city Child" Phi Delta Kappan. (April, 1982), 527-30.

Durflinger, Glenn W. "A Study of Recent Findings on the Prediction of Teaching Success," Educational Administration and Supervision, Vol. 34, (October, 1948), 321-337.

Ellet, Chad D., Capie, William, and Johnson, Charles E. "Assessing Teacher Performance," Journal of Educational Leadership, Vol. 38 (December, 1980), p. 219.

Gargiulo, Richard and Pigge, Fred L. "Perceived Competencies of Elementary and Special Education Teachers," The Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 72, No. 6 (July/August, 1979), pp. 339-343.

Gargiulo, Richard and Pigge, Fred L. "Perceived Teacher Competencies: Need and Development," Action in Teacher Education, The Journal of the Association of Teacher Educators, Vol. 11, No. 1 (Winter, 1979-80).

Hord, Shirley M. and Hall, Gene E. (Editors). Teacher Education Program Evaluation and Follow-up Studies: A Collection of Current Efforts. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1979.

Hord, Shirley M. and Adams, Ronald R. (Editors). Teacher Education Program Evaluation, 1981: Theory and Practice. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1981.

Hord, Shirley M., Savage, Tom V., and Bethel, Lowell J. (Editors). Toward Useable Strategies for Teacher Education Program Evaluations. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1982.

James, Terry and Dumas, Wayne. "College GPA as a Predicter of Teacher Competency: A New Look at an Old Question," Journal of Experimental Education, Vol. 44, Summer, 1976, 40-43.

Lins, Leo Joseph. "The Prediction of Teaching Efficiency," Journal of Experimental Education, Vol. 15 (September, 1946), 2-60.

McNeil, J. D. and Popham, W. J. "The Assessment of Teacher Competence," Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973, p. 230-236.

Medley, D. M. "Closing the Gap Between Research in Teacher Effectiveness and the Teacher Education Curriculum," Journal of Research and Development in Education, Vol. 7, 1973, 39-46.

Medley, D. M. and Mitzel, H. E. "Some Behavior Correlates of Teacher Effectiveness," Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 50, 1959, 239-246.

Morrison, A. and McIntyre, D. Teachers and Teaching. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1969.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, Accreditation of Teacher Education. Washington: NCATE, 1979, p. 10.

Ohio Study Council for Research and Evaluation in Teacher Education. The Identification of Generic Concepts of Effective Teaching as Related to the Ohio Standards. Columbus: State Department of Education, June, 1980.

Pigge, Fred L. "Teacher Competencies: Need, Proficiency and Where Proficiency Was Developed," Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 29, No. 4 (July-August, 1978), 70-76.

Queen, J. Allen and Gretes, John A. "First-Year Teachers' Perceptions of Their Preservice Training," Phi Delta Kappan (November, 1982), 215-16.

Quirk, Thomas J., Witten, Barbara, and Weinberg, Susan. "Review of Studies of the Concurrent and Predictive Validity of the National Teachers Examinations," Review of Educational Research, Vol. 43, No. 1, (Winter 1973), 89-113.

Rosenshine, B. Teaching Behaviors and Student Achievement. England: National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales, 1971.

Schofield, Hilary L. and Start, K. B. "Product Variables as Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness," Journal of Experimental Education, Winter, 1979-80, 48:130-6.

Soar, Robert S. "Teacher Assessment Problems and Possibilities," Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 24, 1973, 205-212.

Soar, Robert S. Medley, Donald M., and Coker, Homer. "Teacher Evaluation: A Critique of Currently Used Methods," Phi Delta Kappan (December, 1983), 239-46.

TEPFU Newsletter. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas (June, 1983).

Vittetoe, Jack O. "Why First-Year Teachers Fail," Phi Delta Kappan (January, 1977), 429-30.

1/5

Bowling Green State University

College of Education
Office of Research and Services
Suite 330 Education Building
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403
(419) 372-0151
Ext 274

Winter, 1981

TO: Recent Graduates
College of Education
BGSU

Dear Teacher Graduate:

We in the College of Education are many times asking ourselves, "Just how well have we prepared our graduates for teaching?" "How valuable are some of the required courses?" "Are we emphasizing needed competencies?" Etc. The purpose of this correspondence is respectfully to ask that you help us arrive at answers to these questions.

Please take a few minutes to give us your honest reactions to the questions posed on the accompanying questionnaire. This questionnaire is being sent to recent BGSU graduates (1976-1980) who are teaching in the State of Ohio. After analyzing your responses and summarizing your comments, we will be in a better position than at the present time to make plans for improving our teacher education programs.

In more detail, there are three primary reasons why the College of Education conducts follow-up evaluative endeavors approximately every third year:

1. We desire to know what graduates think of the courses, projects and expenences in which we more or less forced them to enroll.
2. The responses, as a total group and by each major, should suggest specific and worthwhile changes and revisions in our curriculums.
3. The Ohio State Department of Education and various regional and national accrediting agencies demand that evaluative follow-up studies of past teacher education graduates be completed at periodic intervals and the results utilized to promote better and stronger programs.

Please be assured that your responses will remain anonymous. Only summary tabulations by years of experience, teaching areas, or other groupings will be presented to our faculty and to the accrediting agencies. When your responses have been coded onto computer cards, this questionnaire will be destroyed. Under no circumstances will *your* responses be known to any of our faculty or used to your betterment or detriment.

We are very appreciative of your cooperation in completing this form.

Please return the completed form via the enclosed pre-addressed, postage-paid envelope within 10 days to two weeks of its receipt.
Thank You.

Sincerely yours,

Fred L. Pigge

Fred L. Pigge, Director
Educational Research & Services

___ ___ ___ ___ ___
(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

AN APPRAISAL OF MY PREPARATION AS A TEACHER AT BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY

There are several sections to this questionnaire. Section A asks for personal data, such as name, major, where you are teaching, etc. The other sections consist of questions which permit you to "evaluate" your experiences at BGSU.

SECTION A: Placement and Experience Data

1. Name _____ Social Security Number _____ (6-14)
2. Undergraduate Major(s) _____ (15-17) Minor(s) _____ (18-20)
3. Grades or Subjects Taught During Student Teaching _____ (21-23)
4. Grades or Subjects Taught This Year _____ (24-26)
5. Employing School District _____
   name
   _____
   address
   _____
6. In your opinion, how would your school building be classified?
   _____ (1) Urban _____ (2) Rural _____ (3) Suburban (27)
7. In your opinion, are you teaching in a system that is similar in characteristics to the one where you attended high school?
   _____ (1) Yes _____ (2) No (28)
8. Including the present year, how many years have you taught? _____ Yrs. (29)
9. When did you graduate from BGSU? 19_____ (30-31)
10. What is your current status regarding a Masters degree?
    _____ (1) Have not taken any courses.
    _____ (2) Have taken 1 or 2 courses.
    _____ (3) About ¼ done.
    _____ (4) About ½ done.
    _____ (5) About ¾ done.
    _____ (6) Have a Masters degree. (32)
11. (Optional) What, to the best of your memory, was your final overall undergraduate grade-point average at BGSU?
    _____ (1) 2.0 - 2.3
    _____ (2) 2.4 - 2.7
    _____ (3) 2.8 - 3.1
    _____ (4) 3.2 - 3.5
    _____ (5) 3.6 - 3.9
    _____ (6) 4.0 (33)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECTION B: Your Perceived *Need For* and *Proficiency In* Selected Competencies.

Presented below are descriptions of 19 competency areas. To the right, please indicate your felt need for possessing each competency and an estimate of your classroom proficiency.

	Your Felt Need for this Competency						An Estimate of Your Classroom Proficiency In This Area					
	High		**Average**		**Low**		**High**		**Average**		**Low**	
	[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]		[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]	
Your Ability to												
1. Teach reading in your grade or subject area.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(34)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(35)
2. Deal with pupil behavior problems.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(36)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(37)
3. Select, prepare, and effectively utilize educational media.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(38)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(39)
4. Analyze and evaluate your teaching performance skills.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(40)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(41)
5. Utilize the findings from #4 above in altering your teaching and providing more successful instruction for your pupils.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(42)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(43)
6. Diagnose pupil learning difficulties (via testing instruments, observational techniques, etc.)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(44)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(45)
7. (After diagnosis) . . . make prescriptions of instructional strategies, educational media, and materials that more fully maximize pupil learning outcomes.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(46)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(47)
8. Work effectively with other teachers, specialists, administrators, students, and parents, regardless of their value systems, race, religion, age, sex, socioeconomic status, etc.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(48)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(49)
9. Motivate student achievement via modeling, reinforcement, provision of success experiences, appeal to student interests, etc.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(50)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(51)
10. Individualize instruction to meet the varying needs of students, via techniques such as mastery learning, alternative assignments, individual contracting, group and invidual work, etc.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(52)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(53)
11. Prepare and develop lesson plans and teaching units.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(54)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(55)
12. Prepare teacher made tests and evaluate/report pupil progress.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(56)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(57)
13. Understand and utilize standardized tests.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(58)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(59)
14. Communicate effectively with parents regarding student progress.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(60)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(61)
15. Compare, contrast and utilize various educational philosophical viewpoints.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(62)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(63)
16. Encourage and facilitate the development of children's social skills and enhanced self-concepts.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(64)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(65)
17. Apply the major principles of school law to areas such as due process, contracts, teaching liability, corporal punishment, etc.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(66)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(67)
18. Adequately challenge your gifted/talented students.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(68)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(69)
19. Adequately guide handicapped pupils who have been or may be "mainstreamed" into your classroom.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(70)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(71)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECTION C: Where Were The Proficiencies Developed?

In Section B, you noted your needs and proficiencies for 19 competency areas. We now desire you to denote which of the presented areas contributed to your perceived proficiency for each of the competencies. Merely place an "X" in the box which indicates the one area that gave you the concerned proficiency. If more than one area contributed, put "1" in the box which would denote the area that contributed **most**; "2" in the box which denotes second highest, etc.

Your Ability to:	AREAS							
	Student Teaching	Pre-Student Teaching Field Experience	Other Course Work and Experiences at BGSU	First Year Teaching Experience	Teaching Experience After First Year	Inservice Training	Other Teachers	Supervisors and/or Administrators
1. Teach reading in your grade or subject area. (2 _ _ _ _)	[ ] (72)	[ ] (73)	[ ] (74)	[ ] (75)	[ ] (76)	[ ] (77)	[ ] (78)	[ ] (79)
2. Deal with pupil behavior problems.	[ ] (6)	[ ] (7)	[ ] (8)	[ ] (9)	[ ] (10)	[ ] (11)	[ ] (12)	[ ] (13)
3. Select, prepare, and effectively utilize educational media.	[ ] (14)	[ ] (15)	[ ] (16)	[ ] (17)	[ ] (18)	[ ] (19)	[ ] (20)	[ ] (21)
4. Analyze and evaluate your teaching performance skills.	[ ] (22)	[ ] (23)	[ ] (24)	[ ] (25)	[ ] (26)	[ ] (27)	[ ] (28)	[ ] (29)
5. Utilize the findings from #4 above in altering your teaching and providing more successful instruction for your pupils.	[ ] (30)	[ ] (31)	[ ] (32)	[ ] (33)	[ ] (34)	[ ] (35)	[ ] (36)	[ ] (37)
6. Diagnose pupil learning difficulties (via testing instruments, observational techniques, etc.).	[ ] (38)	[ ] (39)	[ ] (40)	[ ] (41)	[ ] (42)	[ ] (43)	[ ] (44)	[ ] (45)
7. (After diagnosis) . . . make prescriptions of instructional strategies, educational media, and materials that more fully maximize pupil learning outcomes.	[ ] (46)	[ ] (47)	[ ] (48)	[ ] (49)	[ ] (50)	[ ] (51)	[ ] (52)	[ ] (53)
8. Work effectively with other teachers, specialists, administrators, students, and parents, regardless of their value systems, race, religion, age, sex, socioeconomic status, etc.	[ ] (54)	[ ] (55)	[ ] (56)	[ ] (57)	[ ] (58)	[ ] (59)	[ ] (60)	[ ] (61)
9. Motivate student achievement via modeling, reinforcement, provision of success experiences, appeal to student interests, etc.	[ ] (62)	[ ] (63)	[ ] (64)	[ ] (65)	[ ] (66)	[ ] (67)	[ ] (68)	[ ] (69)
10. Individualize instruction to meet the varying needs of students, via techniques such as mastery learning, alternative assignments, individual contracting, group and individual work, etc. (3 _ _ _ _)	[ ] (70)	[ ] (71)	[ ] (72)	[ ] (73)	[ ] (74)	[ ] (75)	[ ] (76)	[ ] (77)
11. Prepare and develop lesson plans and teaching units.	[ ] (6)	[ ] (7)	[ ] (8)	[ ] (9)	[ ] (10)	[ ] (11)	[ ] (12)	[ ] (13)
12. Prepare teacher made tests and evaluate/report pupil progress.	[ ] (14)	[ ] (15)	[ ] (16)	[ ] (17)	[ ] (18)	[ ] (19)	[ ] (20)	[ ] (21)
13. Understand and utilize standardized tests.	[ ] (22)	[ ] (23)	[ ] (24)	[ ] (25)	[ ] (26)	[ ] (27)	[ ] (28)	[ ] (29)
14. Communicate effectively with parents regarding student progress.	[ ] (30)	[ ] (31)	[ ] (32)	[ ] (33)	[ ] (34)	[ ] (35)	[ ] (36)	[ ] (37)
15. Compare, contrast and utilize various educational philosophical viewpoints.	[ ] (38)	[ ] (39)	[ ] (40)	[ ] (41)	[ ] (42)	[ ] (43)	[ ] (44)	[ ] (45)
16. Encourage and facilitate the development of children's social skills and enhanced self-concepts.	[ ] (46)	[ ] (47)	[ ] (48)	[ ] (49)	[ ] (50)	[ ] (51)	[ ] (52)	[ ] (53)
17. Apply the major principles of school law to areas such as due process, contracts, teaching liability, corporal punishment, etc.	[ ] (54)	[ ] (55)	[ ] (56)	[ ] (57)	[ ] (58)	[ ] (59)	[ ] (60)	[ ] (61)
18. Adequately challenge your gifted/talented students.	[ ] (62)	[ ] (63)	[ ] (64)	[ ] (65)	[ ] (66)	[ ] (67)	[ ] (68)	[ ] (69)
19. Adequately guide handicapped pupils who have been or may be "mainstreamed" into your classroom.	[ ] (70)	[ ] (71)	[ ] (72)	[ ] (73)	[ ] (74)	[ ] (75)	[ ] (76)	[ ] (77)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECTION D: Please check the one answer you consider most appropriate. (4 _ _ _ _)

1 The **number** of courses or credits required for my major (e.g. English courses for English majors, Math courses for Math majors, etc.) was:

(6) _____ (1) too large or too many
_____ (2) too small or too few
_____ (3) about right

2 The content of my major was:

(7) _____ (1) well adapted to the needs of teachers
_____ (2) only moderately relevant to the needs of teachers
_____ (3) largely irrelevant to the needs of teachers

3 The content of my major was:

(8) _____ (1) too broad and general for the needs of teachers
_____ (2) too narrow and specialized for the needs of teachers
_____ (3) well balanced to provide both breadth and depth

4 Courses in my major were taught in a way that:

(9) _____ (1) related the content to the needs of teachers in **most** instances
_____ (2) related the content to the needs of teachers in **some** instances
_____ (3) had no observable relationship to the needs of teachers

5 The number of credits or courses required in the professional component (commonly called "the education courses") of the program was:

(10) _____ (1) too large or too many
_____ (2) too small or too few
_____ (3) about right

6 The content and experiences making up the professional component:

(11) _____ (1) were generally well suited to preparation of a teacher
_____ (2) were somewhat suited to preparation of a teacher
_____ (3) made little real contribution to preparation of a teacher

7 The general group requirements (Group 1 — Composition, Literature, Speech; Group 2 — Science and Math; Group 3 — Social Science; and Group 4 — Fine and Applied Arts)

(12) _____ (1) provided for acquisition of a breadth of knowledge needed by "educated" people
_____ (2) was somewhat valuable
_____ (3) was generally a waste of time

8 The general group requirements

(13) _____ (1) provided a good background for teachers
_____ (2) was somewhat significant for prospective teachers
_____ (3) was generally of little significance for prospective teachers

9 Bowling Green State University gave me very early in my studies an adequate orientation to teacher education, e.g., career options, employment potential, working conditions, expectations, salaries, etc.

	5 Strongly Agree	4 Agree	3 No Opinion	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
(14)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

10 Please provide a rating of the value of each of the following seven areas in your preparation to become a teacher

	5 Highly Positive	4 Positive	3 Average or So-So	2 Negative	1 Highly Negative	0 Not Required in My Program	
1. Educational Psychology (Educ. 302)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(15)
2. Methods course (or methods sequence if elementary or special education major)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(16)
3. Tests and Measurements (Most recent title: Assessment and Evaluation in Education) (Educ. 402)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(17)
4. Philosophy of Education (Most recent title: Education in a Pluralistic Society) (Educ. 408)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(18)
5. American School System (Most recent title: Organization and Administration of Education in American Society) (Educ. 409)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(19)
6. Student Teaching	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(20)
7. Student Teaching Seminars	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(21)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECTION E: Off-Campus Field Experiences

Without a doubt you had several experiences in public elementary and secondary schools while a student at Bowling Green State University. The following questions relate to these off-campus experiences

1. How do you feel about the adequacy of the **University** supervision when you were doing:

	5 **Excellent**	4 **Good**	3 **Average**	2 **Bel. Average**	1 **Poor**	
A. Student Teaching	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(22)
B. Other field experiences in the schools, such as Merge, MEP, Methods Observations, etc.?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(23)

2. The above question dealt with university supervision. In the same frame of reference, how do you feel about the adequacy of the supervision given you by the classroom teacher(s) during:

A. Student Teaching	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(24)
B. Other field experiences in the schools, such as Merge, MEP, Methods Observations, etc.?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(25)

3. How do you feel about the value of the field experiences, other than student teaching, such as Merge, MEP, Interaction, Alternatives in Education, Help-A-Child, Milton, Crim's PER, IET's 288 Field Experience, etc. in preparing you to be a teacher?

A. I can't respond because I was not involved in any of these special experiences. [ ]

B. I consider these experiences to have been:

5 Highly Valuable	4 Valuable	3 Average or So-So	2 Of Little Value	1 Of No Value	
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(26)

C. Approximately how many academic quarters were you involved in one or more of these experiences? (Do not count the student teaching quarter)

_____ quarters (27)

SECTION F: Academic and Career Advising at BGSU

	5 **Highly Positive**	4 **Positive**	3 **Average or So-So**	2 **Negative**	1 **Highly Negative**	
1. How do you feel about the quality of advising from your major area, such as the English, Math, Elementary Education areas?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(28)
2. Advice and guidance from the Program Advisement Center located on the 3rd floor of the Education Building?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(29)
3. Advice from individual professors you might have sought out?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(30)
4. How do you feel in a general sense about the quality of overall **academic** advising services that were available to you throughout your years at the University?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(31)
5. How do you feel in a general sense about the quality of overall **career** advising services that were available to you?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(32)
6. Please rate the services of the Career and Placement Center in helping you find a teaching position:	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(33)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECTION G: Instructional Materials at BGSU

1. Please rate the materials and services of the **Instructional Media Center** (located in the Education Building)

[ ] I did not use the center, therefore I cannot rate their service. (34)

	5 Highly Positive	4 Positive	3 Average or So-So	2 Negative	1 Highly Negative	
A. Hours of accessibility	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(35)
B. Workshop facilities where you could prepare new instructional materials or copy existing materials	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(36)
C. Availability of materials	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(37)
D. Usage regulations	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(38)
E. Helpfulness of staff	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(39)
F. Relation to coursework	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(40)

2. Please rate the materials and services of the **Curriculum Library** (located in the Library).

[ ] I did not use the Curriculum Library, therefore I cannot rate their services. (41)

A. Hours of accessibility	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(42)
B. Workshop facilities where you could prepare new instructional materials or copy existing materials	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(43)
C. Various media, such as maps, globes, charts, pictures, films, video/audio tapes, recordings, etc.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(44)
D. Examples of courses of study and teaching units	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(45)
E. Examples of books commonly used in the elementary and secondary schools	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(46)
F. Availability of materials	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(47)
G. Usage regulations	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(48)
H. Helpfulness of staff	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(49)
I. Relation to course work	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(50)

3. Please rate the materials and services of the **Clinical Lab** (located on the second floor of the Education Building and established during the 1978-79 academic year)

[ ] I did not use the Clinical Lab. (51)

A. Hours of accessibility	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(52)
B. Various media and materials	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(53)
C. Helpfulness of staff	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(54)
D. Availability of materials	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(55)
E. Relation to course work	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(56)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECTION H: Your General Reactions

	5 Strongly Agree	4 Agree	3 No Comment	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree	
A. Your Attitudes						
1. I love to teach.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(57)
2. If I could plan my career again, I would choose teaching.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(58)
3. I feel successful and competent in my present position.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(59)
4. I really enjoy working with my students	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(60)
5. If I could earn as much money in another occupation, I would still continue to teach.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(61)
B. Summary						
1. I was adequately prepared by BGSU as an entry level teacher.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	(62)

2. How can we better prepare teachers in your area of specialization? (If possible, give specific suggestions.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. We plan to select at random some principals of our 1976-80 graduates and ask them to respond to questions related to the teacher education program at BGSU and to the success of its graduates. If you have any objections to our contacting your principal about our program and the comparative success of its graduates, please so state below:

_____

_____

_____

Bowling Green State University

College of Education
Office of Research and Services
Suite 330 Education Building
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403
(419) 372-0151
Ext 274

Spring, 1981

Dear Principal:

According to our records, the person listed below who is a recent graduate of Bowling Green State University was teaching under your supervision during the 1979-80 school year.

We at Bowling Green State University are very much concerned about how well our graduates are guiding pupil growth. It is for this reason that we are respectfully asking you to take a few minutes to give us your honest reaction to questions posed on the accompanying questionnaire. These questions pertain to the above teacher's effectiveness in your school situation.

For your information, we communicated with the above named teacher at an earlier date this school year. One statement made to the teacher was:

> *We plan to select at random some principals of our 1976-80 graduates and ask them to respond to questions related to the teacher education program at Bowling Green State University and to the success of its graduates. If you have any objections to our contacting your principal about our program and the comparative success of its graduates, please so state below.*

The above named teacher indicated that he/she did not object to our contacting you for the purposes of this questionnaire.

This questionnaire is being sent to a rather large sample of principals of our recent (1976-80) graduates who are teaching in the State of Ohio. After analyzing the responses and summarizing the comments, we will be in a better position than at the present time to make plans for improving our teacher education programs. We will also be able to certify to our various state, regional, and national accrediting agencies that we have collected and analyzed data on how well our graduates are performing on the job. (The agencies require us to perform these types of data collections at periodic intervals.)

Please be assured that your responses will remain anonymous. Only summary tabulations by years of experience, teaching areas, or other groupings will be presented to our faculty and to the accrediting agencies. When your responses have been coded onto computer cards, this questionnaire will be destroyed. Under no circumstances will your responses be known to the teacher or used to the teacher's betterment or detriment.

We are very appreciative of your cooperation in completing this form.

Please return the completed form via the enclosed pre-addressed postage paid envelope within 10 days to two-weeks of its receipt. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Fred Pigge

Fred L. Pigge, Director
Educational Research and Services

AN APPRAISAL OF THE PERFORMANCE OF A TEACHER PREPARED AT BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY

NOTE: If concerned teacher is no longer under your supervision, check [ ], and return the blank questionnaire. Thank you.

FORWARD

The questionnaire is composed of three parts. Part A attempts to gather data on the placement of the teacher. Part B asks you to rate the teacher in his/her fulfillment of several teaching competencies, and Part C tends to be summary in nature.

PART A

Placement of the Teacher

1. The concerned teacher is assigned what grade(s) or subject areas? _____ (18 20)

2. Counting this year and to the best of your knowledge, how many years of teaching experience does the teacher possess?_____years (21)

3. How would you classify your school? (22)
   1. _____urban
   2. _____suburban
   3. _____rural

PART B

Fulfillment of Selected Teacher Competencies

Presented below and on the following pages are several competencies of effective teachers. Please use the following coded descriptions to rate the concerned teacher. (Just circle the appropriate numeral.)

5 – A very accurate description of the teacher's general performance
4 – Somewhat accurate
3 – Neither accurate nor inaccurate
2 – Somewhat inaccurate
1 – Very inaccurate description of the teacher's general performance

The Teacher:	Very Accurate	Somewhat Accurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inacccurate	Somewhat Inaccurate	Very Inaccurate	
1. Gives clear directions and explanations.	5	4	3	2	1	(23)
2. Evidences fairness, tact, compassion and good judgment in dealing with pupils.	5	4	3	2	1	(24)
3. Demonstrates knowledge in the subject areas.	5	4	3	2	1	(25)
4. Gives students individual help or attention.	5	4	3	2	1	(26)
5. Provides opportunities for all ability levels of pupils to respond and participate.	5	4	3	2	1	(27)
6. Demonstrates enthusiasm for teaching and learning and for the subject being taught at the time.	5	4	3	2	1	(28)
7. Maintains an educational environment conducive to developing positive attitudes toward learning.	5	4	3	2	1	(29)
8. Uses effectively a variety of verbal and non-verbal classroom communication techniques.	5	4	3	2	1	(30)

	Very Accurate	Somewhat Accurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inacccurate	Somewhat Inaccurate	Very Inaccurate	
9. Maintains a social classroom atmosphere which reflects enthusiasm, warmth, support, and respect.	5	4	3	2	1	(31)
10. Maintains self-control in classroom situations with pupils.	5	4	3	2	1	(32)
11. Controls disruptive or deviant pupil behavior objectively.	5	4	3	2	1	(33)
12. Selects goals and objectives appropriate to pupil needs.	5	4	3	2	1	(34)
13. Prepares lessons that are well organized and cohesive.	5	4	3	2	1	(35)
14. Promotes self-awareness and positive self-image in pupils.	5	4	3	2	1	(36)
15. Modifies instruction appropriate to identified learner needs.	5	4	3	2	1	(37)
16. Accepts responsibility.	5	4	3	2	1	(38)
17. Encourages students to take responsibility for their own work.	5	4	3	2	1	(39)
18. Uses acceptable written and oral expression with learners.	5	4	3	2	1	(40)
19. Demonstrates ability to work with individuals, small groups, and large groups.	5	4	3	2	1	(41)
20. Identifies and evaluates learning problems of students in content area being taught.	5	4	3	2	1	(42)
21. Uses positive reinforcement patterns with students.	5	4	3	2	1	(43)
22. Employs a variety of appropriate instructional strategies and techniques to achieve objectives.	5	4	3	2	1	(44)
23. Has realistic expectations for student learning.	5	4	3	2	1	(45)
24. Selects, prepares, and effectively utilizes educational media.	5	4	3	2	1	(46)
25. Maintains a challenging level of instruction.	5	4	3	2	1	(47)
26. Uses skillful questions that lead pupils to analyze, synthesize and think critically.	5	4	3	2	1	(48)
27. Uses valid criteria and procedures for determining pupil achievement of learning objectives.	5	4	3	2	1	(49)
28. Expresses humor when appropriate.	5	4	3	2	1	(50)
29. Motivates students to ask questions.	5	4	3	2	1	(51)
30. Expresses a positive personal attitude toward the teaching profession.	5	4	3	2	1	(52)
31. Teaches reading in his/her grade or subject area.	5	4	3	2	1	(53)
32. Requests appropriate professional assistance when needed.	5	4	3	2	1	(54)
33. Uses more than one method in a single presentation to achieve instructional objectives.	5	4	3	2	1	(55)
34. Determines student readiness for learning.	5	4	3	2	1	(56)
35. Uses information about the effectiveness of his/her instructional program to revise it.	5	4	3	2	1	(57)
36. Follows the policies and procedures of the school district.	5	4	3	2	1	(58)
37. Conveys the impression of knowing what to do and how to do it.	5	4	3	2	1	(59)

	Very Accurate	Somewhat Accurate	Neither Accurate Nor Inaccurate	Somewhat Inaccurate	Very Inaccurate	
38. Provides accurate and prompt feedback to learners about their performance.	5	4	3	2	1	(60)
39. Diagnoses student progress or difficulties and prescribes appropriate instruction and materials.	5	4	3	2	1	(61)
40. Has good working relationship with and is respected by his/her teaching colleagues.	5	4	3	2	1	(62)
41. Works cooperatively and effectively with other teachers, specialists, administrators, students, and parents, regardless of their value system, race, religion, age, sex, socioeconomic status, etc.	5	4	3	2	1	(63)
42. Adequately guides the handicap pupils who have been (or may be) "mainstreamed" into her/his classroom	5	4	3	2	1	(64)

PART C

General Summary

1. Considering total effectiveness in guiding pupil growth, I believe this teacher, when compared to other teachers with similar experience, is: (65)

   _____5. Excellent, very adequate, way above average, etc.
   _____4. Above average, good, etc.
   _____3. Average, adequate, etc.
   _____2. Somewhat below average, etc.
   _____1. Poor, inadequate, way below average, etc.

2. Do you have suggestions as to how we can better prepare teachers? If so, please describe them in this space or attach a separate page.

3. Special comments: (For example, visible strengths and/or weaknesses of teacher education preparation at Bowling Green State University.)

Please return completed questionnaire within 10 day to two weeks of its receipt in the enclosed self-addressed postage paid envelope.